

BELLARMINE COMMENTARY

Vol. 2

MARCH, 1959

No. 1

CONTENTS

Articles

	<i>page</i>
What is the Didache? Edward Yarnold, S.J.	2
Baptism: the Figure and the Reality Juan Lomas, S.J.	9
Come, Holy Ghost Charles Praeger, S.J.	14
The Sacraments, Words of Christ Angel de Horna, S.J.	21

Notes, Summaries and Reviews

(i) <i>Scripture and Fathers</i>	26
(ii) <i>Sacraments and Liturgy</i>	30
(iii) <i>Ecumenical Comment</i>	34
(iv) <i>Other Questions</i>	36

BELLARMINE COMMENTARY is produced twice yearly, for private circulation only, by the theologian scholastics of Heythrop College. All communications should be addressed to: The Editor, Bellarmine Commentary, Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon, England.

WHAT IS THE DIDACHE ?

EDWARD YARNOLD, S.J.

THE DIDACHE is often the first source quoted in collections of early Christian documents. If it really is the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" or "The Lord's Teaching to the Gentiles through the Twelve Apostles", as its two titles claim, its importance can hardly be exaggerated. It is no longer than this article, yet no treatise on early Church organization, or Baptism, or the Eucharist, or Penance, or Holy Order can well avoid discussing it. It begins with a section known as the "Two Ways", a detailed comparison of the lives of good and wicked men (chap. i-vi). Then follow instructions on the ceremony of Baptism (vii); on fasting and prayer, including the Lord's Prayer (viii); a Eucharistic service, containing however no formula of consecration (ix-x); rules for the treatment of apostles and prophets (xi-xiii); a further directive on the celebration of the Eucharist, to be preceded by confession of sins (xiv); an order to elect bishops and deacons to perform the liturgy of prophets and teachers (xv); and finally a description of the end of the world and the Second Coming (xvi). Yet since its first publication in 1883 many critics have suspected that the *Didache* is not what it claims to be, but an imaginative reconstruction of apostolic times, a conglomeration of fragments of the apostolic period, or a deliberate forgery (perhaps by a Montanist: hence the important position allotted to prophets) (1).

To determine the historical value of the *Didache*, it is clearly important to discover its date. This has often been attempted by comparing the *Two Ways* of the *Didache* with other versions of the *Two Ways* to be found in writings of the early Christian era. The so-called *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas* both contain versions; indeed, *Barnabas'* treatment is so similar in vocabulary (and sometimes in order) to that of the *Didache* that dependence of one on the other or at least a common source is undeniable. There also exists a Latin version of the *Two Ways*, which corresponds so closely to the Greek of the *Didache* that the former is generally regarded as a translation of the latter. This we shall call the *Doctrina*.

J. A. Robinson was so struck by the unity of style in *Barnabas* — the language of the *Two Ways* is frequently anticipated in the earlier part of the *Epistle* — that he was convinced that Barnabas was the first to elaborate the *Two Ways* (it is, of course, contained in germ in the OT and St Paul); this, Robinson thought, was then copied with many modifications by the author of the *Didache*; finally the author of the *Doctrina* translated the *Two Ways* of the *Didache* with an eye on *Barnabas*, and so included a few phrases of *Barnabas* not to be found in the *Didache*, and omitted some passages of the *Didache* not to be found in *Barnabas*. Hence the *Didache* is later than *Barnabas*, and is probably not earlier than the middle of the second century A.D., and little historical value can be attached to it (2).

The discovery of the *Manual of Discipline* among the Qumran Scrolls knocked the bottom out of Robinson's argument, for it likewise

contains a *Two Ways*, resembling the other versions in some respects very closely. As no one, I think, is prepared to hold that the *Manual of Discipline* is an adaptation of Christian ideas to the Jewish religion as practised at Qumran, we are forced to admit that Barnabas derived his *Two Ways* from a Jewish source, and it is again open to discussion whether Barnabas copied the *Didache* or vice versa.

P. Audet's theory

Père J.-P. Audet, O.P., proposed a revolutionary solution in a monumental edition of the *Didache* which appeared in 1958 (3). He thinks that the *Doctrina* is a translation, not of the *Didache*, but of an unknown Jewish *Two Ways* written in Greek and copied independently by both *Barnabas* and the *Didache*. He has two reasons for suggesting that the *Doctrina* is the most primitive of these three versions. First, examination of the differences of phraseology in the *Didache* and *Doctrina* seem to indicate that the latter is the more Judaic (pre-Christian) in tone. Apart from the Christian addition of an invocation of the Trinity at the end of the work, everything in the *Doctrina* could be Jewish; an obviously Christian passage in the *Didache* based on the Sermon on the Mount (1.3 ff.) is omitted by the *Doctrina*. Secondly, Audet points to the resemblance between the *Doctrina* and the *Two Ways* of the *Manual of Discipline*, and suggests that *Barnabas* and the *Didache* have less in common with the Qumran document than the *Doctrina* has. In this way Audet seeks to free the *Didache* from dependence on *Barnabas*, and is able to propose the exciting theory that the *Didache* is the work of two authors or compilers, both of whom were probably apostles (though not from among the Twelve), and dates from about 50-70 A.D.

It is the purpose of this article to attempt to show that Audet's vindication of the *Didache* is unacceptable for three reasons: (1) Audet overemphasizes the pre-Christian tone of the *Doctrina*; (2) in general plan it is the *Didache* which is closest to the *Manual of Discipline*; (3) it is *Barnabas'* version of the *Two Ways* that is closest to that of the *Manual of Discipline* (4).

(1) Is the *Doctrina* pre-Christian?

Lack of space and the desire to keep Greek quotations to a minimum must preclude the detailed examination of Audet's argument on this point. Discussion of a few sample passages must suffice.

In three places in 4.9-10, the *Didache* speaks of "God" (*theos*) where the *Doctrina* speaks of "the Lord" (*dominus*). Audet believes that a Christian translator would not substitute the more Judaic term "the Lord" (where the reference is not to Jesus) for the more usual Christian title "God"; therefore the *Doctrina's* reading seems primitive and pre-Christian, while the *Didache's* is a Christian adaptation. This argument, however, loses much of its force, because it can be shown that Christian translators tended to render *theos* as *dominus* (cf. the Greek original and old Latin translation of *Hermas*, *Pastor*, Vis. I.ii.1 and I.iii.1).

Audet constructs a similar argument on the readings at 4.1: the *Didache* reads "the word of God (*theou*)", the *Doctrina* "the word of the Lord God (*domini dei*)". It is however significant that the parallel passage in *Barnabas* (19.9) reads "the word of the Lord (*tou kuriou*)". It is therefore at least a possible, and perhaps the most plausible, explanation that the *Doctrina's* version is the latest of the three, and represents a combination of the other two.

At 3.7 the *Didache* reads "the meek will inherit the earth (*tên gên*)". The *Doctrina* gives instead of the "earth" the "holy land (*sanctam terram*)". Audet comments with some justice that one would not expect a Christian translator to expand his Greek original into such a Jewish-sounding phrase. Now the words of the *Didache* are derived almost word for word from Mt 5.5 or Ps 36 (37).11. Is it really any easier to believe that a Jew, composing the Greek original of the *Doctrina*, would add to a Psalm in this way? The phrase "holy land" occurs only once in the OT, in Zach 2.12 (16): "The Lord will inherit Judah as his portion in the holy land"; but the word used here for *land* in the Hebrew (*adam*) is different from that used in the Psalm (*eres*), and more properly means *soil* (though *gên* is used in both passages in the LXX). It is therefore a little more likely that a Latin translator would add the *sanctam* to explain (perhaps wrongly in fact) the meaning of *terram*, than that a Jewish compiler would paraphrase the text from the Psalm; for the text of the Psalms in Greek would be far more fixed in the 1st or 2nd century A.D. than the Latin text of the Gospels.

These three sample passages must suffice here to show that the "Judaic" character of the *Doctrina* is far from proved. The *Doctrina's* omission of the passage derived from the Sermon on the Mount can be explained by accepting the view of Audet and others that this section is a later addition to the *Didache*; the version of the *Didache* translated into Latin must have been one that did not contain the addition.

To conclude this section one can point to a passage (4.3) in which the *Didache's* reading sounds more pre-Christian than the *Doctrina's*, for the former quotes Deut 1.16-17 much more closely than does the latter (5).

(2) The *Didache* and the Manual of Discipline

The *Doctrina* contains nothing but the *Two Ways*; *Barnabas' Epistle* is a treatise on the fulfilment of OT types in the New Law, to which the *Two Ways* forms a kind of epilogue. But both the *Didache* and the *Manual of Discipline* are handbooks of the liturgy and of moral instruction, which includes the *Two Ways*. The resemblance also extends to points of detail:

(a) Both documents contain initiation ceremonies: the *Didache* gives rubrics for Baptism (7.1 ff.); the *Manual* begins with a long description of an initiation ceremony (1.1-3.12), and later refers to those who "are not to enter the waters and come into contact with the purificatory rite of the men of holiness" (5.13) (6).

(b) Preliminary instruction is required before initiation: in the *Didache* (7.1) it appears that it is the *Two Ways* that must be learnt before Baptism; the *Manual* prescribes that "anyone from Israel who offers himself to join the body of the community must be examined . . . And if he is a fit subject for instruction, he (the examiner) should introduce him into the covenant" (6.14).

(c) The initiation ceremony in the *Manual* bears many resemblances to the Eucharistic service in the *Didache* (chap. 9, 10 and 14). The *Didache* prescribes confession as a preliminary (14.1; cf. 4.14); the *Manual* states that "the Levites shall relate the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their guilty transgressions and their sins under the domination of Belial. (And) those who enter the covenant shall make confession after them, saying 'We have done wrongly . . .'" (1.22 ff.). Both services contain prayers of praise or thanksgiving: in the *Manual* (1.18 ff.) "the priests and the Levites shall recite the praises (*mebârekim*) of the God of salvation and of all His faithful works"; the *Didache's* service is a *eucharistia*, i.e. blessing or thanksgiving (the word is often the Greek equivalent of the noun derived from the verb BRK used in the passage from the *Manual* quoted above, in which God is thanked, blessed or praised "for the life and knowledge you have made known to us through Jesus your servant" (9.3), and especially "because you are mighty" (10.4). The service in the *Manual* is for those who "enter the covenant", and is followed by an account of the annual "passing" of all the members (2.19 ff.); the service in the *Didache* ends with an invitation to come forward: "if anyone is holy, let him come" (10.6). Both services contain the response Amen. Even the prayers over the bread and wine in the *Didache* have a parallel in another passage in the *Manual* (not from the initiation service), which directs that at meals "the priest shall put forth his hand first of all to invoke a blessing (*lehibbârêk*, again from BRK) on the bread and the must" (6.5).

(d) One can also (though there is danger of wishful thinking here) point to passages of severe tone in the *Manual* which seem to have more humane parallels in the *Didache*, as befits a Christian document. In the *Manual* (5.8) the candidate takes an oath "to return with all his heart and with all his soul to the Law of Moses, according to all that He commanded, in regard of all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok the priests . . ."; the *Didache* takes more account of human frailty: "if you can bear the whole yoke of the Lord, you will be perfect; but if you cannot, do what you can" (6.2). Instead of the curse on "the men of Belial's party" in the initiation ceremony in the *Manual* (2.4), the *Didache's* Eucharist merely has a prayer for delivery from all evil; in contrast with the *Manual's* injunction to bear "perpetual hate towards the men of perdition" (9.23) is the *Didache's* command to "hate no man" (*ou misêseis panta anthrôpon*: 2.7).

(e) Both the *Didache* and the *Manual* have descriptions of the end of the world. Both of these passages foretell the purification or refinement of man: the *Manual* has "then will God purify by His truth all works of man and will refine for Himself some of the sons of man"

(4.20); the *Didache* reads "then shall the creation of men come to the test of fire" (*tên purôsin tês dokimasias*: 16.5). In both the consummation is to be preceded by the increase of lawlessness (*Man.* 4.19; *Did.* 16.4). The *Manual's* "then shall the truth come forth to victory throughout the world" (4.19) is paralleled by the *Didache's* "then shall appear the signs of truth" (16.6).

Now is the common Jewish heritage sufficient explanation of all these points of correspondence? Or are there so many similarities that we must conclude that the *Didache* has borrowed from the *Manual*? I am inclined to accept the latter explanation, though the borrowing is not so exact that we must believe the author of the *Didache* had the *Manual* before him while he was writing; nor that he was indebted to the *Manual* for (c); for as the Eucharist is derived from Jewish ceremonial, a resemblance between the two rites is to be expected.

(3) Barnabas and the Two Ways

Audet believes that the *Doctrina's Two Ways* is closest to that of the *Manual*. He can point to the fact that the *Manual's* prediction that the "sons of truth" will be rewarded with a "crown of glory" (4.9) has no parallel save in the *Doctrina*, which concludes (before the Christian formula): "per haec sancta certamina pervenies ad coronam" (6.5). One can, however, argue that *Barnabas* (21.1), though not mentioning the crown, has other points in common with the *Manual* in his treatment of rewards which are not to be found in the *Doctrina*; moreover, the concept of the crown after the struggle is common in St Paul (cf. 2 Tim 2.5 and 4.7), so that it is possible that the Christian addition to the *Doctrina* includes the remark about the crown. Again, Audet argues, it is only the *Manual* (4.1) and the *Doctrina* (1.1) that speak of the ways as being "in the world". This is a valid point, though, as Audet admits, by itself of little weight.

But in vocabulary and imagery Barnabas has most in common with the *Manual*: so much so that, if there is any borrowing between *Barnabas*, the *Didache* and the *Doctrina*, it seems to me undeniable that *Barnabas* is the source tapped by the other two. The *Didache* describes the two ways as ways of "life and death" (1.1,2; 4.14; 5.1). The *Doctrina* announces them as ways of "life and death, light and darkness" (1.1), but thereafter like the *Didache* treats them simply as ways of life and death. Barnabas, on the other hand, introduces them as ways of light and darkness, and keeps to this terminology throughout, whenever in parallel passages the *Didache* and *Doctrina* speak of life and death; though he does speak of the way of death in two passages (19.2; 20.1) without parallel in the *Didache* or *Doctrina*. Again, the function of the good and bad angels is treated summarily in the *Doctrina* (1.1), omitted altogether from this part of the *Didache*, but treated at length by Barnabas (18.1; the devil is "the Black One — *ho melas*": 20.1). In these questions of imagery and treatment of angels *Barnabas* corresponds with the *Manual*, which is shot through with the metaphors of light and darkness, and emphasizes the warfare of the spirits of light and darkness.

One could draw the immediate conclusion that for the *Two Ways* the *Didache* borrows from *Barnabas* while the *Doctrina* is a conflation of the other two, were there not a point in which it is the *Doctrina* that bears the closest resemblance to the *Manual*. There is no exact equivalent in *Barnabas* or the *Didache* to the *Doctrina's* angels "unus aequitatis, alter iniquitatis" (1.1); but there is a fairly close equivalent in the *Manual's* phrase "spirits of truth and wickedness" (3.18). However, in view of the other indications that the *Doctrina* is secondary to *Barnabas*, we are, I think, justified in accepting Robinson's explanation that this phrase is derived from Hermas' version of the *Two Ways*. Hermas (Mand. 6.2) wrote of the spirits of "justice" and "wickedness", and this is translated in the early Latin version of the *Shepherd* "unus aequitatis et unus iniquitatis". If, as it seems to me we should, we accept Robinson's explanation, it follows that the *Doctrina* is a conflation of the other three Christian versions of the *Two Ways*.

The *Manual's Two Ways* is a *description* of two human lives, one inspired by the good spirit, one by the bad. *Barnabas*, the *Didache* and the *Doctrina*, on the other hand, give mainly lists of commands and prohibitions; and while perhaps there is not much to choose between *Barnabas* and the *Didache* on this point, it is the *Doctrina* which is least like the *Manual* here, because its "way of life" is almost entirely a list of prohibitions. Now Hermas (Mand. 6.2) follows the *Manual* in making his *Two Ways* a description rather than two lists of precepts. We have here, therefore, another piece of evidence to suggest that Hermas' contact with the *Manual* was not made through any of the other versions of the *Two Ways*.

We have seen reason to reject Audet's view that it is the *Doctrina* that is most closely related to the *Manual*: we have also seen reason to believe that the *Didache* derives from the *Manual* in a way in which the other documents do not. It now appears that in the section dealing with the *Two Ways* *Barnabas* and Hermas each have their peculiar affinities with the *Manual*. Can one explain these affinities by the common heritage of Jewish thought? Is it possible, that is, that the Christian works owe nothing here to the *Manual of Discipline*, but derive all their ideas from OT, Rabbinical and Christian sources? Some grounds are given to this view by resemblances to the *Manual* in St Paul's thought. St Paul gives catalogues of vices and virtues; he speaks of the growth of the power of "the man of sin . . . , the son of perdition . . . , the wicked one" (2 Thes 2.3 ff.) in an apocalyptic passage; he reminds the Ephesians (2.1) of "your offences and sins, wherein once you walked according to the fashion of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air about us", and of their struggle "against the world-rulers of this darkness" (6.12; cf. Col 1.13). Or have we to conclude that even St Paul was influenced by Qumran?

This would perhaps be going too far; but the elaboration of the *Two Ways* joined to the doctrine of the good and wicked angels is not to be found in the OT; the *Manual*, indeed, seems to regard the *Two Ways* as a rather esoteric doctrine (3.13 ff.). The conclusion, therefore, seems to

be that the *Two Ways* reached Barnabas and Hermas (and even St Paul?) through the Qumran sect, and in a form that bore close relations to the *Manual of Discipline*; and that though the author of the *Didache* was acquainted with the general pattern of the *Manual*, the details of the *Two Ways* reached the Didachist through Barnabas, and reached the author of the *Doctrina* through the other three Christian versions.

Conclusion

Much of the evidence has had to be omitted here, but space must be found for two more hints that point to the priority of *Barnabas* over the *Didache*. The first is suggested by the comparison of the eschatological passages in the *Didache* (16) and *Barnabas* (4.9 ff.). Similarity of vocabulary suggests very strongly that one is copying from the other. We have already noted the resemblance between the *Didache's* eschatological passage and that in the *Manual*. Barnabas' version is more diffuse than the other two, and, unlike them, does not foretell the revelation of truth; but the image of sprinkling is to be found in *Barnabas* (5.1) and the *Manual* (4.21), but not in the *Didache*. Moreover, in two places the *Didache's* language seems to be derived from *Barnabas*. Firstly, Robinson noted that, while the *Didache* hazards no conjectures about the time of the Last Day, in *Barnabas* it is imminent ("Let us be attentive in the last days . . . now in the time of lawlessness . . .": Barn. 4.9); now, other things being equal, it is to be presumed that the version that expects an imminent end of the world is likely to be the earlier. Secondly, as F. C. Burkitt argued (in a review in *JTS* 33 (1932) 25ff. of J. Muilenburg's dissertation *The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*), the *Didache's* "sign of the stretching forth (or spreading: *ekpetaseôs*, 16.6)" in the sky is hard to explain without reference to Barnabas' linking of both Moses' prayer with outstretched arms and Is 65.2 ("I spread out — *exepetasa* in the LXX — my hands all the day") with the Cross (Barn. 12.2 ff.) (7). Therefore, though the *Didache's* apocalypse seems to be more closely copied from the *Manual* than its *Two Ways*, even here there is reason for thinking it secondary to *Barnabas*.

The second piece of evidence is more cogent: the two great commandments of the New Law ("First thou shalt love the (eternal) God who made thee; secondly thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself": Did. 1.2; cf Mt 22.37,39) are put together in the *Didache* and *Doctrina*, but, for no obvious reason, separated in *Barnabas* (19.2,5). One can understand how, if *Barnabas* is the original, the author of the *Didache* might see fit to change the order of his model in order to get the two great commandments together; one can see no reason why Barnabas should have separated them if he found them together in the *Didache* or *Doctrina* (8).

If the general argument of this article has been sound, the fact emerges that the *Didache* is later than *Barnabas*, which is generally assigned to about 135 A.D. (though some critics do put *Barnabas* earlier). Consequently, unless and until a much earlier date can be established for

Barnabas, one cannot have confidence in the *Didache's* picture of the Church in apostolic times.

References:

- (1) In the canonical lists in Eusebius (H.E., III, 25, 1 ff.) and Athanasius (P.G. 26, 1437 ff.) the *Didache* is placed among the uncanonical works, though it is not classed as heretical. The Muratorian Fragment makes no mention of it.
- (2) Cf. J. A. Robinson, *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*, S.P.C.K., London, 1920. A revised version of part of this work was published in JTS 35 (1934) 113-46 and 225-48.
- (3) J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè: Instructions des Apôtres*, Paris, 1958. I do not claim to have presented all his arguments, but I hope my presentation and criticism of his case have not been unfair.
- (4) Robinson and others, by comparing individual texts of "*Barnabas*" and the "*Didache*", seek to show that the former is more primitive. I have not the space to reproduce many of their arguments.
- (5) Did. (4.3): Thou shalt judge justly, thou shalt not favour persons in correcting faults (ou lēpsei prosôpon elenxai epi paraptômasin). Doct.: Judge justly knowing that thou shalt be judged; thou shalt not oppress anyone in his fall (non deprimes quemquam in casu suo). A literal translation of the LXX text of Deut 1.16-17 is: Judge (plural) justly . . . ; thou shalt not favour persons in judgment (ouk epignôsei prosôpon en krisei).
- (6) My thanks are due to Fr E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J. for his kindness in putting his translation of the "*Manual of Discipline*" at my disposal and helping in other ways.
- (7) Some scholars, including Audet, think that the *Didache's* "sign of the spreading" is the opening of the heavens, not the sign of the Cross. But their interpretation seems less plausible. There can be little doubt that the *Didache's* "sign of the spreading in heaven" is a paraphrase of St Matthew's "the sign of the Son of Man in heaven" (Mt 24.30). Now the Cross seems much more likely to be sign of Christ than the opening of the heavens. Moreover the *Didache's* words are "the spreading in (not of) heaven"; and there is besides little linguistic justification for translating *ekpetasis* as opening. The passages of the Apocalypse that speak of the opening of heaven (19.11 and perhaps 6.14) use different words.
- (8) The two great commandments are found only separately in the OT (Deut 6.5 for the first; Lev 19.18 for the second). There is no evidence that the Qumran monks joined them together; on the contrary, it seems unlikely, for universal charity, as we have seen, was not one of their precepts. Therefore we have here a strong argument against Audet's view that the *Doctrina* is pre-Christian. In this and other passages of the *Doctrina*, where other critics detect a debt to N.T. writings, Audet has to postulate that the N.T. writer has borrowed from an Essene source.

BAPTISM: THE FIGURE AND THE REALITY

JUAN LOMAS, S.J.

TYPOLOGICAL explanation of Scripture finds its grounds in the NT and is the obvious result of a deep-rooted conviction of the "historical unity" of both Testaments, which was general among the Fathers. It is true that some of them went occasionally too far in their endeavour to bring out the "spiritual sense" of Scripture; but often enough we find a sufficient consent in their teaching for us to classify a given doctrine as traditional in the Church.

This is the case with Baptism. Apart from a few instances of over-subtle interpretation of types, mainly in the school of Alexandria, as was to be expected, the same figures come up again and again, and in authors as widely different from one another as Justin, Tertullian, Ambrose, Origen and Chrysostom. The explanation of the nature and effects of Baptism by means of its types forms normally the largest part of their instructions to neophytes, and they insist that it is not merely a question of examples or metaphors: they are "testimonia", "signa", predestined by God far back in past ages to warrant the sacred origin of Baptism, together with its sanctifying and transforming power. The legitimacy of such an interpretation is occasionally guaranteed by Revelation in the NT, as we shall see later.

We might well start by considering the two different approaches to scriptural figures which are represented by Augustine and Basil, and which if joined together give us the whole meaning of a type. Augustine underlines the similarity, and in a sense the unity, of the type and the thing figured, being, as he was, mainly concerned to safeguard the divine origin of both Testaments against the Manichees: type and anti-type are two interventions of God in a "similar mode" in two stages of history (1). It was Basil's task, on the other hand, to stress the difference between the Old and New Testaments against the Pneumatomachi, since it is only under the new dispensation that we are raised up so as to share the divine nature; Old Testament events, apart from possessing a real meaning in themselves, are not more than the foreshadowing of things to come, which will surpass them by far as instances of God's operation in the world (2).

St. John Chrysostom sums up both aspects in a popular and vivid way: the type is like a drawing: merely the "outline" of reality, details being lacking there. It is necessary for colours to be added to give us the whole thing in its full value: this only takes place in the anti-type (3).

The principal occasion for neophytes to receive Baptism used to be the Paschal Vigil; it is the central theme of that day's liturgy. We shall now go through the baptismal figures which it suggests to us, in our Roman Liturgy, and which are also precisely those most often used by the Fathers; the latter will supply us with their interpretation.

The Water of Creation

The first lesson of the Paschal Vigil, narrating the Creation in the beginning, is generally the first figure to come up in the Fathers: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth . . . The Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters" (Gen 1. 1-2). One would think at first sight the reference to Baptism to be rather thin. Yet it has its grounds in Scripture: Isaias foretold a "new creation" in messianic times, using the same word (*bara'*) as in the opening of Genesis (Is 48. 6-7); and when Our Lord revealed the mystery of the new dispensation to Nicodemus, he mentioned a new birth by water and the Spirit: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (Jo 3.5). And for St. Paul the Christian is a new creature (2 Cor 5.17).

As regards the water of the first chapter of Genesis, the Fathers stress the life-giving power that water has been granted by the communication of the divine Spirit; the opposite aspect, that is to say its destructive force for all the evil in the world, will be considered in connection with the Deluge as a further type (4). Water was made the source of life in the beginning to symbolize the life we were to be given in Baptism; and, in making it so, God was predestining the healing of mankind by means of water (5). On the first day of Creation, as well as now in messianic times, it is from the Spirit of God that water draws its life-giving and sanctifying power; he came down upon the Jordan when Jesus was being baptized; he is the principal cause of both material and spiritual life (6). The same thought occurs in our liturgy for the blessing of baptismal water.

We may mention in passing the expression of the relation between Christians and Christ in terms of "fish" that we occasionally find in the Fathers. The word "*ichthus*" and the painting of a fish were symbols of Christ through the acrostic reference of the letters (*Iêsous Christos Theou Huios Sôtêr*); the Christians are encouraged to imitate that "fish" and are called "little fish" in their turn because they have found their new life through water (7).

The Deluge

We come now to one of the figures most frequently mentioned in the instructions to neophytes: the Deluge. And we know by Revelation that the Deluge was, as a whole, a type of Baptism intended by God: "... In the days of Noe, while the Ark was building. In that Ark a few ... were saved through water. Its counterpart, Baptism, now saves you also ..." (I Pet 3.20-21). The figure is taken up in the Paschal Vigil at the blessing of baptismal water.

The principal aspects of resemblance are: a world of sin destroyed by water, and a righteous man attaining salvation through that same water and the wood of the Ark, to be the head of new generations.

In the Deluge a sinful world came to an end through water: Tertullian calls it "purifying water, baptism of the world" (8). In our Baptism the seal of the world on our flesh, our personal sins, are also destroyed by water in a like manner; and a new creature comes out of it (9). This links up with the very Pauline type of our death with Christ: the immersion in and emergence from the baptismal font are a material representation of our death, burial and resurrection with Christ: "we were buried with him by means of Baptism into death, in order that, just as Christ has arisen from the dead ... so we also may walk in newness of life. For if we have been united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be so in the likeness of his Resurrection also" (Rom 6. 4-5). But it is not necessary for us to wait until our bodily resurrection takes place: a "spiritual resurrection" has already been effected through Baptism, and we are leading a new life with Christ and for Christ: "If you have risen with Christ, seek the things that are above" (Col 3.1) (10).

As a counterpart of the death of the world in the Deluge, a just man, Noe, brought salvation and new life to the world through the wood of the Ark on the water. Noe is a figure of Christ, the Just *par excel-*

lence, who worked our salvation by the wood of his Cross in the water of Baptism (11).

Looking at things from a slightly different angle, some Fathers consider the Ark as a type of the Church. In any case the equation of type and anti-type does not demand the exclusion of further references. The comparison here is plain: outside the Church there is no salvation. But the Church does not merely "preserve" her children, as the Ark did: she transforms them by raising them to a new supernatural life. Once again, as we saw in St. Basil, the greatness of the new dispensation far surpasses the figures of the past (12).

Finally, just as in the water of Creation, the sanctifying action of the Holy Ghost is considered by the Fathers as foretold in the Deluge: he descended upon the Jordan under the appearance of a dove; a dove went back to the Ark with the symbol of peace for that "new generation", about to start a new life in the world; and the Holy Ghost comes down upon our flesh, when leaving the baptismal font cleansed from our former sins, to give us our adoptive sonship, which is true new life and peace with God (13).

The Crossing of the Red Sea

We have now reached the most important baptismal type in traditional teaching: the crossing of the Red Sea. It is dealt with in the second lesson of the Paschal Vigil and repeatedly mentioned in the "Exsultet": "Haec nox est in qua patres nostros eductos de Aegypto, Mare Rubrum sicco vestigio transire fecisti". We again find in the NT a guarantee of the legitimacy of typological interpretation here:

"Our fathers were all under the cloud and all passed through the Sea, and all were baptized in Moses, in the cloud and in the Sea . . . Now, all these things happened to them as a type" (1 Cor 10.1-2, 11).

The crossing of the Red Sea, the consummation of Christ's redemptive work by his Resurrection, and the Baptism of neophytes, are all three celebrated together in the Paschal Vigil; and by doing so, the Church underlines that it is one complete redemptive action that we are celebrating now in three different stages of history: the figure, the reality and the Sacrament (14).

Among the various events of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, it is mainly the actual crossing of the Red Sea, the cloud and the pillar of fire that provide the Fathers with typological elements. The neophytes are the elect, like the Children of Israel of old, called by God to a new Promised Land. The water of the Red Sea was for the Israelites the providential way of attaining deliverance, as is Baptism for us. That same water was the cause of death for Pharaoh and his army; thus the twofold power of water, saving and destructive, which we considered in the Deluge comes up again. Our pursuers are Satan and the evil spirits, eagerly endeavouring during the time of instruction preceding our Baptism — a time of struggle, according to the Fathers — to keep us under their power; their grip on our flesh is destroyed by the water of Baptism.

Most of the Fathers who mention this last type consider Redemption as a victory of Christ over the devil, thus delivering us from his

power; Baptism applies this victory and deliverance to each one of us (15). For Gregory of Nyssa, however, our pursuers are our own passions, which rush headlong with us into the baptismal font to find their death there, through the grace we receive in the Sacrament (16).

In the text quoted above from the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the cloud was so closely linked with the water of the Red Sea that Baptism was also attributed to it: "They were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea" (I Cor 10.2). On the other hand we find in both Testaments that a cloud is the visible sign of God's special presence: in the cloud of glory of the old Tabernacle and Temple, in the Holy Ghost's overshadowing of Mary, and in the Transfiguration of Christ. Hence the Fathers concluded that the cloud symbolized the Holy Ghost. The cloud is the symbol of his special presence as the principal cause of the miracle worked at the Red Sea: he protected the Israelites under his shadow as he also was to cover Our Lady at the Annunciation; and he brought death to the pursuers in accordance with Moses' Canticle: "Flavit Spiritus tuus et operuit eos mare" (Ex 15.10). Again, as on the first day of Creation and in the Deluge, the Fathers believed that the Holy Ghost was symbolized there together with the water, as a single principle of salvation; and thus that Our Lord's words to Nicodemus had already been foreshadowed in the OT: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (Jn 3.5) (17).

The pillar of fire is Christ, because he is the light of the world (Jn 8.12). By the pillar of light, appearing just after the crossing of the water, he intends to show in figure that Baptism is a true supernatural "enlightenment": it is well known that the newly-baptized used to be called "the enlightened" in the first centuries of the Church (18). The paschal hymn "Exsultet" beautifully joins in the symbol of the Paschal Candle the figure, the reality and the Sacrament, as was mentioned above. The Candle represents the pillar of light — a figure in itself — which enlightened the Children of Israel after their miraculous deliverance:

"Haec igitur nox est
quae peccatorum tenebras columnae illuminatione purgavit".

It also represents our risen Saviour:

"Flammas eius lucifer ille matutinus inveniat . . .
Ille qui regressus ab inferis humano generi serenus illuxit".

Finally, it is a material symbol of the enlightenment worked in the souls of the neophytes through the faith and the grace of the Sacrament:

"Haec nox est
quae hodie per universum mundum in Christo credentes . . .
a caligine peccatorum segregatos,
reddit gratiae, sociat sanctitati" (19).

It will be fitting to finish by recalling again that sense of historical unity, already cited as characteristic of the Fathers. Sacred History is not a chaotic conglomeration of facts with no bearing on one another. There is a common end to which things converge; there is the mark of Providence there, governing them for our good and the manifestation of God's glory. And there is a "pedagogical style" of God, which links up

types and realities, "so that we can contemplate the present in the past and the past in the present" (20) for the confirmation of our faith; "et ut ex perceptione praesentium munerum, firma sit expectatio futurorum" (21).

References:

This article owes much to J. Daniélou, "Bible et Liturgie" (Paris 1951), "Traversée de la Mer Rouge et Baptême aux premiers siècles" R.S.R. 33(1946)402.

(1) PL 42.269.

(2) PG 32.124-125.

(3) PG 51.247.

(4) Nevertheless the Coptic and Syrian Liturgies point out, even in this place, that destructive power which, by the Spirit of God, has been transformed to good. P. Lundberg, "La Typologie Baptismale dans l'ancienne Eglise" (1942), pp. 12-13.

(5) Tertullian, De Baptismo 2; Didymus of Alexandria, PG 39.692.

(6) St Ambrose, De Sacramentis 1.15.

(7) St Ambrose, De Sacramentis 3.3; Tertullian, De Baptismo 1.

(8) De Baptismo 8.

(9) St Justin, Dialogus cum Tryphone 138; Didymus of Alexandria, De Trinitate 2; St Ambrose, De Mysteriis 10.

(10) St John Chrysostom, PG 61.348; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, PG 33.1081.

(11) St Justin, Dialogus cum Tryphone 138; cf Rom 6.5.

(12) St Cyprian, Epist. 68.2; Chrysostom, PG 48.1037-1038.

(13) Tertullian, De Baptismo 8; St Ambrose, De Mysteriis 10; Chrysostom, PG 48.1037-1038.

(14) J. Guillet, "Thèmes bibliques", pp. 22-25. See also M. Boismard, O.P., "La Typologie baptismale dans la première épître de Saint Pierre", La Vie Spir. 416(1956)339.

(15) Tertullian, De Baptismo 9; Didymus the Blind, De Trinit. 2.14; St Ambrose, De Mysteriis 1.3.13; De Sacramentis 4.12; St Cyril of Jerusalem, PG 32.1068; Origen, In Ex. Hom. 5.1.

(16) PG 44.361.

(17) St Ambrose, De Mysteriis 12 & 13; Origen, In Ex. Hom. 5.1.

(18) St Ambrose, De Sacramentis 1.22; Clement of Alexandria, Stromata 1.24.

(19) A few Fathers complete the typology of the Red Sea with Moses as a figure of Christ, leading his people to the Promised Land (St Cyril of Jerusalem, PG 32.1068); and with Mary (Moses' sister) as a figure of the Church, rejoicing over her new-born children (Zeno, PL 11.509-510). A further series of types is brought into the Coptic and Ethiopic liturgies for the blessing of baptismal water: the crossing of the Jordan by Josue to enter the Promised Land, Elias likewise crossing the Jordan before being taken up to heaven, the miracle worked on Eliseus' axe through water and wood, and the cleansing of Naaman by the water of the Jordan.

(20) St Hilary, De Mysteriis 3 ff., 36 ff.

(21) Former Liturgy of Holy Saturday, prayer of the 7th Lesson.

COME, HOLY GHOST

by CHARLES PRAEGER, S.J.

1. "All ye holy Patriarchs and Prophets . . ."

WHAT happened at Pentecost? The answer seems simple: before his Passion, Our Lord promised that after he had gone back to heaven he would send the Holy Spirit; and at Pentecost he kept his promise. Yet the matter is not as simple as that. If the Holy Spirit did not come until Pentecost, why do we say in the Creed: "Qui locutus est per prophetas"? and if we reply that he spoke through the prophets

without dwelling in them, a still more serious difficulty remains. Salvation was not denied to those who lived before Christ: hence those who were saved must have had grace; but grace surely implies the indwelling of the Holy Trinity. It seems then that the Holy Spirit who came at Pentecost had been with his People all along.

About ten years ago this problem was discussed by G. Philips in two articles (1) which attempted to decide whether there was a difference in kind or only in degree between the grace given to Christians and that given to the just men of OT times. (For brevity we will refer to the latter as "OT saints".) Most theologians hold that the difference is one of degree. Philips favours the minority view, which was held by Cardinal Manning among others: that there was a real justifying grace in the OT which nevertheless did not imply personal inhabitation by the Holy Spirit. This grace was a preparatory one.

Behind this seemingly historical dispute lies a theological difference of opinion. What is the nature of the indwelling of the Holy Trinity? Most theologians today hold that inhabitation is only appropriated to the Holy Spirit, and that a soul in grace has no special relation with any one of the divine Persons but only a relation with all Three. This theory is the basis of the view that the OT saints must have enjoyed the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, even if not as abundantly as Christians. The Church has not yet decided the question of appropriation as applied to the indwelling: Pope Pius XII left the matter open in "*Mystici Corporis*"; and the question of the OT saints was likewise left open by Leo XIII in his encyclical on the Holy Spirit (*Divinum Illud*). Still, the view that OT grace was essentially the same as ours has been prevalent in the Western Church since the time of St Augustine; and the burden of Philips' argument is that this tendency began for polemical reasons and has been fostered by neglect of the Greek Fathers, to the impoverishment of the theology of salvation.

The core of the Greek Fathers' theology of Redemption is the idea of the "divinisation" of man through the Incarnation. St Irenaeus says that the deification of man is the work of the Incarnate Word pouring out his Spirit on us at Pentecost (*Adv. Haer.* III.17.1. PG 7.929,930). St Cyril of Alexandria says that all humanity is contained in Christ, and in him we received the Spirit at the Incarnation. We lost the Spirit in Adam and regained the Spirit in Christ. As the firstfruits of restored human nature, Christ received the Spirit first, but on our behalf: "*non sibi ipsi . . . sed nobis potius in seipso*". The diffusion of the Spirit waited upon the glorification of Christ, "*hoc est, post Resurrectionem*". The prophets were illuminated by the Spirit; but in us he dwells, "*ipsum Spiritum inhabitare penitus et hospitari confidimus*". We are truly temples of God: the prophets were not (in Jn 7.39. PG 73.749-760). In another place St Cyril says that when Our Lord rose from the dead he gave the Spirit of adoption of sons, and that this explains Lk 7:28: ". . . there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist; yet the least in the kingdom of God is greater than he" (In Lk 7.28. PG 72.618-620).

In St Augustine there was a tendency towards the same doctrine as

St Cyril's, but it was checked by the need to refute the Pelagians, who pointed to the OT saints as men who had reached sanctity unaided by grace! This led St Augustine to say that they were justified by faith in the future Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection of Christ. The later Latin Fathers tended to follow St Augustine in this, and to minimise the difference between the OT and the NT. The OT saints were represented as Christians in all but name. Thus St Leo the Great says that grace is really the work of the whole Trinity and is merely intensified in the Christian era. The Scholastics in general followed in St Augustine's footsteps too. The OT saints received grace through the foreseen merits of Christ. They were "Christians before the time". This is still the general teaching of theologians today.

We have already seen how St Cyril interpreted the key-text Jn 7.39 ("the Spirit had not yet been given, seeing that Jesus had not yet been glorified"). St Augustine comments on the same text that the prophets had the Holy Spirit, and so had Elizabeth (Lk 1.41) and Zachary (Lk 1.67) and Simeon (Lk 2.25); hence Jn 7.39 does not mean that there was no gift of the Spirit till Jesus was glorified, but that the manner of the gift was different: at Pentecost the gift was accompanied by unheard-of signs. Later commentators on the same text speak in similar vein. Maldonatus: compared with the full and visible gift of the Spirit at Pentecost, the former gift of the Spirit was as nothing. Cornelius a Lapide: the Spirit was not yet given so copiously or visibly. Knabenbauer: the Spirit would be given more manifestly and more abundantly than in the OT. A Lapide, commenting on the Pentecost text itself (Ac 2.4), says that the Spirit is *given* to all the just but is not said to be *sent* to everyone; and he quotes Richard of St Victor who, in a sermon on the Mission of the Holy Spirit, distinguishes infusion (partial gift), diffusion (full gift) and effusion (gift to overflowing).

St Thomas deals expressly with the question whether the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit is to all who are in grace (S.T.1,43,6). He proposes the difficulty that the OT saints had grace but do not appear to have had the Spirit, since Jn 7.39 says the Spirit was not yet given. Invoking the authority of St Augustine, he replies that the Spirit *was* sent to the OT saints; and he explains that we must understand Jn 7.39 of the gift accompanied by visible signs which marked the day of Pentecost. In the next article, St Thomas asks (S.T.1,43,7,6) why there was no visible mission in the OT since there was an invisible mission. He answers that the visible mission of the Son had to come before that of the Holy Spirit, since the Holy Spirit manifests the Son as the Son manifests the Father. He allows that there were visible appearances of the divine Persons to the OT saints, but says that these cannot be called visible missions because their purpose was not to designate the inhabitation of a divine Person by grace but to manifest something else. Here again he appeals to St Augustine.

We have strayed somewhat from Philips in order to show something of the weighty tradition which he ventures to challenge. As we have said, he claims that modern theology has tended to overlook the Greek

Fathers on this point ; and he believes that the thought of St Thomas shows a bias in favour of St Augustine and a lack of attention to St Cyril. In the second of his articles he examines Holy Scripture.

St Paul sometimes speaks as though there were no grace till Christ came (see for instance Gal 4.1-7) ; yet elsewhere he makes it clear that Abraham and the other OT saints were justified by faith. The solution must be that salvation came in stages, and that there is a specific difference between the OT stage and the NT stage. Even our stage is an intermediate one : we have the firstfruits of the Spirit, but creation is still groaning in anticipation of full sonship (Rom 8.18-23). The greater gulf, however, lies between the OT saints and ourselves : *they* believed in the promises, but *we* are assimilated to Christ. A new era came in with the Resurrection : we are a new creature in Christ.

The Epistle to the Hebrews treats expressly of the OT/NT relationship. The continuity is made clear (no Marcionite dichotomy!), but the transcendence of the NT is equally clear. For all their merits, the patriarchs did not see the promise fulfilled, "for God had something better in view for us ; so that they should not be perfected without us" (Heb 11.39,40) : that is, they did not find access to God in advance of us.

It is St John who gives the Greek Fathers the starting-point for their theology of Redemption. His Gospel stresses the reality of the Incarnation, and provides a basis for St Cyril's doctrine that eternal life depends on physical union with Christ ("physical" in Cyril's sense). How was such union possible for the OT saints? There was no adoptive sonship till the Incarnation. Philips comments on Jn 7.37-39 that the Spirit is sent by the Son and the river of life flows from the Body of Christ : here we have two aspects of grace, corresponding to the two Missions, that of the Son and that of the Spirit. But the Spirit is not given till Christ is glorified. The Incarnation is the beginning of his glorification but not its consummation : when the Son has returned to the Father, then the Spirit will be given without measure. In OT days the Spirit was at work, but by transitory inspirations, prophetic illuminations, individual charismata : only at Pentecost did the real era of the Spirit begin, when he came to dwell permanently in all the members of Christ.

The Christian life, then, is something wholly new ; and so the grace of the OT saints must have been different : not just an anticipation but a preparation ; not just Redemption in advance, but something essentially incomplete. If our existing theological categories do not allow for such a difference, perhaps they should be expanded ; for there is a great deal at stake : by more or less equating OT grace and NT grace, you admittedly make it easier to explain how the OT saints were saved, but you diminish the importance of the missions of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Philips suggests a distinction between OT and NT grace on these lines : OT grace was not just exterior and juridic ; it was an interior,

supernatural gift. Nevertheless, it was something inchoate, a promise, not the fulfilment. It was not the gift of sonship, putting the OT saints in direct relation with the divine Persons. The just men of OT times were "minors" (cf. Gal 4.1-7). Within the order of habitual grace, there must be degrees of actuation, amounting to a difference in kind. Between the sanctifying grace bestowed on the Sacred Humanity and that bestowed on us, there is a specific difference. Even Our Lady's grace is different from ours by more than a difference of degree. These differences arise from different relationships to the Holy Trinity. Surely there must be a correspondingly great difference between our grace and that of the OT saints, to whom the Trinity was not revealed. It is noteworthy that the divine Persons are never revealed except in the act of giving themselves to men. "*Mitti est cognosci*", said St Augustine and St Thomas. The revelation of the Trinity goes with the communication of the Trinity. Both are peculiar to the messianic age. OT grace assimilated men to God, for God's plan of sanctification is a continuous one; but it assimilated them to God in his unity, whereas NT grace assimilates us to God in his Trinity. "The invisible missions of grace", says Philips in clear contradiction to St Thomas (S.T. 1.43.7 *supra*), "do not *precede* but *follow* the visible missions of the Incarnation and the effusion of the Spirit".

Philips' thesis is highly controversial. No doubt many would reject his view of inhabitation, to start with. Even the appeal to the Fathers is a delicate matter, for it is not always easy to say whether the language of a given text favours a difference in kind or in degree. Thus St Cyril says in one place that Jn 7.39 means there was not yet the complete and perfect inhabitation of the Spirit in men; from which we might have deduced that he admitted some inhabitation in the OT saints. On the other hand St Augustine says in a sermon on Pentecost (No. 185, date unknown) that the Spirit was then present to his faithful ones no longer by the grace of his visitation and operation, but by the very presence of his majesty: words which could imply that for Augustine inhabitation was peculiar to the NT. Again, some might question Philips' argument that since the OT saints did not know the Holy Spirit as a distinct Person they cannot have had the gift of the Spirit. After all, there is no question that today a man of good will can be in a state of grace, though perhaps quite unaware of the doctrine of the Trinity. However, the comparison really fails, for the revelation of the Trinity has now been made, even though an individual may be ignorant of it; and we are concerned with the divine economy of salvation rather than with special cases. In the last resort there is this in favour of Philips' thesis: that it lends itself more easily to the ontological view of Redemption (which everyone accepts) than does the traditional theory which he opposes. The latter easily allows for the juridical aspect: in so far as we are saved by Christ's merits, the OT saints may be said to have been saved by those same merits foreseen; but it is less simple to explain the ontological aspect of Redemption — incorporation into Christ — if you hold that the OT saints already had the indwelling of the Spirit and were "Christians in all but name".

2. "If I do not go, he will not come".

It may seem that we have now answered the question we posed at the outset: What happened at Pentecost? We have not quite done so yet. Even supposing that the gift of the Spirit awaited the messianic age, it is not certain that it awaited the day of Pentecost. On the evening of the day of his Resurrection Our Lord breathed on his apostles and said: "Receive the Holy Spirit" (Jn 20.22). This text caused the Fathers many a wrinkled brow. If the Spirit was given on this occasion, what of Pentecost? What of Christ's words at the Last Supper: "If I do not go, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you" (Jn 16.7)? What of the statement that the Spirit would not be given till Jesus had been glorified (Jn 7.39)? St John Chrysostom (PG 59.471; 60.20) thought that perhaps in Jn 20.22 Our Lord was only preparing the Apostles to receive the Spirit. However, Theodore of Mopsuestia was condemned by the 5th General Council in 553 for (*inter alia*) denying that Christ really gave the Spirit on this occasion (Dz 224). Most of the Fathers and later commentators hold that the Spirit was really given, but not as fully as at Pentecost, not publicly and visibly but privately and for the specific purpose of remitting sins: after all, there are varieties of gifts (I Cor 12.4). Thus Eusebius (PG 24.1010), St Jerome (PL 22.993), St Cyril (PG 74.717), Maldonatus, Cornelius a Lapide, Knabenbauer, in their commentaries on Jn 20.22. Rabanus Maurus (PL 107.314) says the Apostles received the Holy Spirit twice — once after the Resurrection and once at Pentecost—as Christians are twice anointed with chrism: once at baptism and once at confirmation. One early writer suggested that the Spirit was not *sent* but *given* in Jn 20.22, and that the promise in Jn 16 referred to his sending. We have already seen that a Lapidé made this distinction in another context. Most of these commentators readily affirm that the Apostles already had the indwelling of the Spirit: we can hardly expect them to deny to the Apostles what they granted to the OT saints. St Jerome ventures to say that they had the Holy Spirit from the time when they first believed in Christ, "*sed pro modulo atque mensura*" (PL 22.995). Maldonatus says they could not have loved Our Lord unless they had had the Spirit. A Lapidé says they had already received the Spirit in their Baptism and Holy Communion: they now have the Spirit conferred on them to enable them to remit sin; at Pentecost they will receive his fulness to enable them to convert the Gentiles.

It was probably the Greek Fathers who found most difficulty with Jn 20.22, because they were not so ready to grant that the Spirit had been given since OT times. St Cyril says Jn 20.22 was a foretaste of Pentecost, a preliminary fulfilment of the promise, Pentecost anticipated, the firstfruits of restored human nature. Christ had not yet ascended, but was already glorified in his Resurrection. Hence the principle of Jn 7.39 remains intact: the Spirit was not given till Jesus was glorified. We may recall here that Our Lord himself said after his Resurrection: "Did not the Christ have to suffer these things before entering into his glory?" (Lk 24.26).

It is quite a common opinion that the gift of the Spirit waited on the Redemption but did not wait on the Ascension. In a sermon attributed to Chrysostom but probably by Hippolytus (PG 59.735-746), the words "he gave up his spirit" (Jn 19.30) are taken to mean that Jesus then breathed the divine Spirit into the whole world. More than one non-Catholic writer has recently taken the words to mean "he handed on the Spirit" (2). Whether or not the Greek, as they claim, suggests this, the parallel text of Luke (Lk 23.46) hardly supports it. It may be one of those cases where St John uses a phrase with a double meaning. Bover (3), in a commentary on Jn 7.37-39, points out that in Jn the "glorification" of Jesus often means his death (e.g. 12.23; 13.31,32; 17.1-5). Bover applies 7.38 (in an accommodated sense) to the piercing by the lance and the water gushing from the Sacred Heart. Thus when Jesus is glorified his Heart is opened: the source from which men were to receive the Spirit. This signifies that the Spirit is now given.

A somewhat similar picture is given by Vergote (4) in an interesting study in Johannine theology. Elsewhere in the NT (especially in St Paul and Acts) the Passion is seen as an act of humility, rewarded by subsequent glory in the Resurrection and Ascension. Phil 2.5-11 is a notable instance, where the very Incarnation has the character of a self-humiliation. Without contradicting this, St John prefers to see in the Incarnation the manifestation of Christ's glory (cf. Jn 1.14). The supreme moment of this manifestation or glorification is on the Cross, which gives Jesus power to bestow the divine life. Vergote points out that the term "lifted up" in Jn is a kind of play on words: it connotes exaltation (cf. Is 52.13: "he shall be exalted and lifted up"), but it also renders the Aramaic word for "crucify". St John symbolically sees in the lifting up on the Cross Our Lord's return to his Father, which we usually associate with the Ascension.

It is remarkable that so many of the texts we have considered are from Jn. Some writers, seeing in them a convergence of evidence, have reached a more radical conclusion than any we have mentioned hitherto. They think St John teaches that Christ ascended to heaven on the day of the Resurrection. This theory is put forward by Benoit (5); by Dohmes (6), writing soon after Benoit but apparently independently; by the Anglican, C. S. Mann (7), and by others. C. K. Barrett (8), while hesitating to accept this theory, does hold that Jesus was glorified in his death, and thinks that perhaps "one compound event of crucifixion and resurrection" signifies, for John, Christ's return to the Father. Lightfoot (9) thinks Our Lord must have ascended within a week of his Resurrection, though he says that in a sense his return to his Father can be said to have occurred at the moment of his death. These writers insist strongly on St John's vision of Passion, Resurrection, Gift of Spirit as elements in one single act of exaltation. This is borne out by liturgical history; for the early Church celebrated Easter and Pentecost as one Feast lasting fifty days, and there was no separate Feast of the Ascension till the fourth century: the first homilies for this Feast are by St Gregory of Nyssa and St John Chrysostom. Dom Odo Casel has clearly indicated this liturgical development (10). There is a surprising amount of evi-

dence too from the Fathers prior to the fourth century, suggesting (not decisively proving) an Ascension on the first Easter Day. The champions of this theory have no great difficulty in reconciling it with the clear evidence of Ac 1.1-11 that Our Lord ascended after forty days. But that is another story.

References:

- (1) G. Philips, "La Grâce des Justes de l'Ancien Testament," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 23(1947)522-556; 24(1948)23-58.
- (2) C. S. Mann, "The NT and the Lord's Ascension," *Church Quarterly Review*, 158(1957)452-465; Hoskyns, "The Fourth Gospel", 1947.
- (3) Joseph Bover, S.J., "Christus, fons aquae vitae", *Verbum Domini*, 1(1921)109-114.
- (4) A. Vergote, "L'exaltation du Christ en croix selon le quatrième évangile", *Eph. Theol. Lov.*, 28(1952)5-23.
- (5) P. Benoit, O.P., "L'Ascension", *Revue Biblique*, 56(1949)161-203.
- (6) Ambrosius Dohmes, O.S.B., "Pentekoste und Pfingsten", *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift*, 58(1949)129-137.
- (7) Mann, *op. cit.*
- (8) C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John*, 1955.
- (9) R. H. Lightfoot, "S. John's Gospel, A Commentary", 1950.
- (10) Odo Casel, O.S.B., "Art und Sinn der ältesten christlichen Osterfeier", *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft (Münster)*, 14(1938)1-79.

THE SACRAMENTS, WORDS OF CHRIST

ANGEL DE HORN, S.J.

MOST theologians agree that the sacraments are "instruments". Sacraments are in one sense or another instrumental causes of grace. When the theologians explain this by examples they say that the sacraments are like the strings of a harp touched by the skilful hand of a musician, like the tools a carpenter uses when he makes a table, like the brushes of an artist . . . The sacraments, instruments as they are, must be united with Christ who is the principal cause of grace.

Nevertheless there is something that is not so commonly said, though it might be presupposed by the theologians. It is the distinction between those instruments which are intrinsically united with the principal cause and those which have an independent being of their own and are therefore extrinsic to the principal cause. Let us take the example of an artist painting in his studio. He uses canvas, brushes, colours . . . all these things are external, independent of the artist. But the artist uses also his hands, his eyes, the wonderful mechanism of his imagination. These powers of the artist—will, mind, creative imagination,—the acts of those powers, and those astonishing tools, his hands and eyes, are real instruments; although the kind of union with the principal cause is far superior to the union of brushes and colours with it.

When, therefore, we say that the sacraments are instruments in the hands of Christ, which kind of instrument are we referring to? What is the kind of union the sacrament has with Christ?

We may start by making quite clear that Christ can work without any kind of instrument. He is God, and God needs—in our human way of conceiving divine things—only to will something and it is made. Nevertheless God wanted to speak to men, he himself wanted to become

a man, he joined to his "Logos" an individual humanity. The hypostatic bond of union was so close that the link between human soul and body seems loose in comparison with it. So the Humanity of Christ became the instrument of the "Logos". The Sacred Humanity as a whole and its individual powers, members and acts are true instruments of God.

St John reports these words of Christ :

" . . . but the works of God were to be made manifest in him. I must do the works of him who sent me while it is day; night is coming, when no one can work. As long as I am in the world I am the light of the world". When he had said these things, he spat on the ground and made clay with the spittle, and spread the clay over his eyes, and said to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloe (which is interpreted 'sent')". So he went away, and washed, and returned seeing. (Jn 9.3-7).

In this beautiful passage of the Gospel we see Christ at work, and using various instruments. God wants to manifest something. There is still time for it. Christ works a sign. It is clear that God, and God alone, can give sight to one who was blind from his birth. The will of God is the principal cause of this miracle. Does the human will of Christ play any part in the wonderful cure? The answer to this question is of great importance for the solution we give to the problem of sacramental causality. Certainly God might have cured the blind man independently of Christ. But Christ was there : he was one Person in two natures, and had a mission received from the Father : to speak to men, in a human way. Just as an artist who wants to paint something cannot dispense with using his hands and brushes, God, who had chosen to speak to men in human words, could not dispense with using his human will, his human words. Even in this particular case he wanted to use even the dust he was treading on and the water of a pool near by. And the words of Christ, both the spoken words and the actions (symbolic words), were effective.

It is possible to think that the action of the mud on the eyes of the blind man, his going towards the pool of Siloe and washing there, are so far away from the order in which the cure was done that it seems impossible for them actually to have done anything in the cure. It is true they were not instruments of the cure in the sense in which medicines are instruments in the hands of doctors. But they were signs of the will of Christ, both his divine will and his human will, and they worked by signifying, because of the connexion they had with Christ's will and because of the necessity that this will had of using exterior signs in order to manifest itself to men.

Words and signs caused because they signified. This is also to be rightly understood. The words "Go, wash in the pool of Siloe" in themselves have a meaning. This meaning is constant provided that the words are pronounced correctly. It is irrelevant to the meaning of the words in themselves whether they are pronounced by a man or by a recording machine. We do not refer to this meaning of the words when we say that the sign works by signifying. We refer to the link these words had with the will of Christ, to the connexion the words and signs used by Christ had with his mission of manifesting something to men. As long as those signs were an expression of the will of Christ they were

instruments of his almighty will, instruments which had to be used if the will of God was to be made manifest to men in the way God had chosen to manifest it.

It was not enough that words and signs were expressions of the human will of Christ, because the human will cannot cause such a supernatural effect as miracles are. Words and signs signified, and caused by signifying, because they were integral parts of the complex activity of Christ-God speaking and giving something to men.

When Christ went up to heaven, God could no longer speak to men and give them his divine gifts using as an instrument his hypostatically united body, his words, the actions of his hands. Nevertheless he has remained with us in the Church. The Church is his body. The Church is something more than a human society. Peter, the Apostles and their successors are something more than mere representative agents. Bishops and priests are in a sense independent beings and in this sense they are agents of Christ. They are the rational instruments of Christ, because an agent is the means by which the will of his principal is carried out. But the union of Christ, as principal cause, with his ministers is closer than any natural link of human relation.

The sacraments are the actions of the Mystical Body, the actions of Christ: they are meaningful words and actions and cause by signifying, by expressing the actual will of Christ with relation to this particular man.

It is not the conventional meaning that words have in themselves that causes grace by signifying. A drunken man may pour water on the head of an infant and at the same time pronounce the form of Baptism. Nevertheless there is no Baptism at all, although the words of the form still have their meaning and the simultaneous action of saying the form and pouring the water still has a concrete significance. But there is not even a human action, less still an action of the Mystical Body of Christ. It is not a meaningful speech of God and therefore it does not signify as sacraments do, and consequently it does not cause grace as sacraments cause it.

When Baptism is correctly conferred what is it that happens? God takes possession of his new temple. Supernatural grace gives the new Christian a new life. God does this. It is God who signs his covenant of love with the neophyte. It is God who applies the merits of his redeeming blood to this particular human being. Nobody but God can do all this. But God expresses in fact his redeeming will by using the means of communication with men which he has chosen. Furthermore, he expresses his will by using his own body, his Mystical Body. This body is his own, although it is not united to him by a hypostatic bond. Nevertheless the bond is very close, closer than the bond between the servant and his master or a king and his ambassador.

When a man speaks or gives an order, it is impossible to tear asunder the will to speak and the actual meaningful speech. One complex human activity is taking place. When a sacrament is conferred, the sounds of the form, the application of the matter, the activity of the minister and the juridical rights and obligations which originate from

the lawful performance of the rite are the speech of God. God causes grace as he speaks, he is the principal cause. The Church, his Mystical Body, and the activity of this body are the instruments God uses. These instruments are united with the principal cause and make with the extra-temporal will of God one complex temporal activity. The sacraments are temporal activities of God : they are God speaking in time to particular men. And the words of God are efficacious.

What happens when the sacrament is validly conferred but is inefficacious because of the lack of disposition in the recipient? Is the sacrament inefficacious? Let us continue with the example of Baptism. An adult wants to be baptized, although he is not ready to give up a sinful habit. A minister of the Church, unaware of the sinful dispositions, confers the sacrament. According to our definition of sacrament, in this act an objective and efficacious manifestation of the will of God has taken place. The extra-temporal will of God has expressed itself in a temporal way. The words of the form, the application of the matter, the activity of the priest, the new rights and obligations originated in the neophyte by the lawful performance of the rite, everything is there. Even God signs with this man his covenant of love, chooses this man as one belonging to his chosen people. The will of God and his expression are faultless, perfectly valid. Nevertheless it is true that supernatural grace has not been given to this man. There is not any causality of grace, grace is not caused. But it is not because of any fault in the cause itself; it is because of a condition which is lacking. This condition is the disposition of the neophyte who does not want to accept the love of God which is given to him. We know from the Old Testament that God was faithful to his people even when they were straying away from him and he was punishing them. This is exactly what happens in this case ; God expresses his love for this man, signs an eternal covenant of love with him, although this man is serving other gods.

In the theory above the problem of reviviscence is not a problem at all. The will of God has been expressed and perseveres although the rite, the external utterance of this will, have passed away. As soon as the people in the Old Testament repented of the sins for which they were being punished, God forgave them. It is a constant theme in the Old Testament that God is faithful, that he stands by his word, that he never goes back on the covenant he has once signed. But there is still more. It is true that the rite is over, nevertheless the rite is only one part of the external manifestation of God's will. There is also a permanent expression of the will of God. This is the symbolic speech of the character in the soul and those rights and obligations which had their origin when the rite was performed. God is still "speaking" grace to this man and, as soon as the obstacle is removed and the man accepts God's grace, the sacrament achieves its effect.

To sum up, the following points may be made:

1. The problem considered above is: how is it possible for the sacraments to cause grace? Grace is taken comprehensively, that is to say the inhabitation of the Trinity in the soul and the transformation of the soul by inherent sanctifying grace.

2. The sacraments are instruments of Christ. Instruments must be united to the principal cause, and the sacraments are united. The kind of union is not that of a tool with the artist, but that of the hands and actions of the artist with him.

3. The miracle-cure illustrates that Christ used different instruments, all of them "joined" instruments, although by different kinds of union. Those instruments were: the human will of Christ and its acts, other acts of Christ's humanity, mainly those connected with speech, the spittle, the mud, the walking of the blind man to the pool and his washing there.

4. The instrumental effective causality of those words and actions of Christ, and even the actions of the blind man following the orders of Christ, is to be found precisely in the connexion they have with the almighty will of Christ. They are effective because they express the will of Christ, because they form one complex activity together with that will. God's speech is effective primarily because of his will to speak, instrumentally because of the means of expression required.

5. In Palestine God used his humanity as an instrument hypostatically united to express his will. In the sacraments God uses his Mystical Body. God uses the minister and the sacraments as his own hands and actions, not as tools.

6. The sacraments as the external expression of God's will embrace not only the actual rite but also the character and the juridical status required by the recipient, in those sacraments in which these lasting effects are produced.

7. The sacraments require from the recipient an act of acceptance of grace. In the sacraments God signs a covenant, gives his divine life. Acceptance is required although it is only a condition for the sacrament to exercise its causality of grace.

NOTES, SUMMARIES AND REVIEWS

(i) SCRIPTURE AND FATHERS

Pax hominibus bonae voluntatis.

MANY readers of Knox's New Testament must have wondered at his rendering of the song of the angels in Lk 2.14: "... and peace on earth to men that are God's friends". This note summarises evidence from the Qumran scrolls which may be said to establish as certain the exegesis reflected in Knox's paraphrase.

The true reading of the Greek has long been debated. A numerical majority of manuscripts suggested a "triple verse": "Glory to God in the highest/ And on earth peace,/ goodwill (*eudokia*) among (or towards) men"—the latter variants depending on whether *en* was read or the simple dative. Thus was reached the classical English rendering, which in our post-Christian age retains for many nothing but a vague wish for general benevolence at Christmastide. As against this, there was already general agreement among scholars that the correct reading is that supported by few, but the oldest, manuscripts and by the Vulgate:

"Glory to God in the highest,

And on earth peace among men of goodwill" (*eudokias*).

General agreement had also been reached on the interpretation of *eudokia*; it is not men's good will but God's good pleasure. It was realised which Hebrew word must stand behind *eudokia*, namely *râṣôn*, which means goodwill, favour, acceptance, and which, as the language developed, increasingly had the special sense of God's good pleasure and will.

The only weak link in the exegetical argument was that our existing Hebrew texts provided no parallel for the phrase which had to be assumed behind the Greek, namely *anshê râṣôn* (men of God's good pleasure) or *benê râṣôn* (sons of . . .). Without such justification the phrase was felt by many scholars to be difficult; it was doubtless just this difficulty which had given rise in ancient times to the easier but weaker reading. Now this link has been provided several times over, both by two exact verbal examples in the *Hôdayôth* or hymns from Qumran, and by numerous parallels for the idea in the *Manual of Discipline*. The quotations which follow are from Father E. F. Sutcliffe's still unpublished translation (1); I am very grateful for the permission to use this most accurate version.

I know, not to man does righteousness belong

Nor innocence of conduct to a son of man.

To God Most High belong all works of righteousness,

But the way of man cannot be steadfast

Except by the impulse of God's spirit.

His it is to make innocent the ways of the sons of man,

That they may make known all His works of might and power

And the multitude of His mercies

To all the sons of his good pleasure ('*al kol-benê reṣônô*).

And again:—

From Thine anger [come] all judgements of affliction,
And from Thy goodness manifold forgiveness.
Thy mercies are on all the sons of Thy good pleasure
(*lekôl benê reşonekâ*).

For Thou hast given them knowledge of the secret of Thy truth
And understanding of Thy wondrous mysteries.

—Hymns, 1QH 4.30-33 and 1QH 11.8-10.

Of the many parallel expressions in the *Manual of Discipline*, the most striking is in the following passage:—

When there are these men in Israel, the body of the Community will have been established in truth as an eternal plantation, a house of holiness for Israel and a foundation of a Holy of Holies for Aaron, witnesses of the truth for judgement and the elect of [God's] good pleasure (*behirê râşôn*), to atone for the land and to requite the wicked with their deserts. —*Manual of Discipline*, 1QS 8.4-7.

In these phrases the writer of course means his own community, elsewhere called "sons of light", "sons of righteousness", "sons of truth", "sons of the eternal congregation", "men of holiness", "men of God's lot" (portion) and other similar titles. The sense of community displayed is very like that of the Christian Church which was soon to arise in the same country.

One question of interpretation has remained, though recent discussions agree on the probable answer (2). Is God's "good pleasure" his satisfaction with good men, or his will to bestow justification and redemption? The general mentality of the Qumran sect would permit the former interpretation, and Christian theology will allow it in a sense, not through our merits but because we are now in Christ, of whom the Father has said "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Mt 3.17). Man's re-entry into God's good pleasure through the Incarnation is certainly part of the Christmas message which the angels celebrated in their hymn. But the contexts of the two passages from the Qumran hymns, both stressing God's initiative, favour the latter interpretation of *râşôn/eudokia*, whereby it means virtually the same as "grace", not a divine approval of man's goodness but a gratuitous gift to man. In fact, the Qumran hymns show a notion of grace developing beyond what we know from the Old Testament. Theologically, it makes little difference to us which aspect we stress in God's good pleasure, revealed and granted to us in the Incarnation, and hymned with the angels in the Gloria of the Mass.

Robert Murray, S.J.

References:

- (1) In Father Sutcliffe's forthcoming work: "The Monks of Qumran as depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with translations into English".
- (2) C. H. Hunzinger in "Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft", 41(1952-3)85-90 and 49(1958)129-130. E. Vogt, S.J. in "Biblica", 34(1953)427-9, revised and translated in "The Scrolls and the New Testament", edited by Krister Stendahl, S.C.M. Press, 1958.

A Text of St. Irenaeus on the Church. A New Interpretation.

Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiolem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio (*Adversus Haereses* III, 3, 2).

In his strikingly original comment on this exhaustively discussed passage the Abbé Nautin (1) maintains that *hanc ecclesiam* does not refer to the church of Rome, as all commentators, both Catholic and Protestant, during the past four centuries have assumed, but to the universal Church. St. Irenaeus, then, is simply saying that each local church must be in agreement with the universal Church. M. Nautin reconstructs the Greek of the original text and translates as follows:

Car l'Eglise à laquelle, en raison de sa puissance plus forte, il est nécessaire que se réunisse toute église, c'est-à-dire les fidèles de partout, c'est celle en qui toujours par les gens de partout a été conservée la tradition qui vient des apôtres.

Paraphrasing slightly in accordance with his interpretation the English would be

For the Church with which all local churches (that is the faithful in every part of the world) must concur is, by reason of its more powerful authority, that Church in which the tradition derived from the Apostles has always been preserved by those who are in every part of the world.

Not only, he claims, is this the natural meaning of the sentence, considered in itself and in its context, but also it removes the difficulties resulting from the traditional interpretations — difficulties to which no satisfactory solutions have so far been discovered. His chief arguments are as follows:

1. The sentence itself. Composed with a characteristic attention to style it naturally falls into two parts (a) *Ad hanc ecclesiam . . . fideles*, (b) *in qua . . . traditio*. Moreover, the *eos qui sunt undique fideles* of the protasis and the *ab his qui sunt undique* of the apodosis, chiasmatically arranged, emphasise the correspondence between the two parts of the sentence. Now, by "the church in which the tradition derived from the Apostles has always been preserved by those who are in every part of the world" Irenaeus can only mean the universal Church. Using similar phrases in several other passages he lays great stress on the universality of the Church in time and place. It was common practice in his day, whenever a dispute arose in any church about doctrine, to appeal to the other churches.

2. The context. (a) The underlying thought of the context is not that unity of faith depends on union with Rome but that it results from each church having preserved the tradition which it can trace back to an Apostle.

(b) *Necesse est* stands in contrast to *praeterquam oportet colligunt* at the end of the previous sentence. Irenaeus has just been saying that by instancing the Apostolic tradition of the Roman church he confounds "those who form illegitimate assemblies". The sentence "*Ad hanc*

enim ecclesiam . . ." is parenthetical, explaining a characteristic which, as he has already implied, an assembly must have if it is legitimate, that is, if it is entitled to be called a church.

(c) If *hanc ecclesiam* refers to Rome it is strange that Irenaeus should introduce the example of Rome with a comparatively trivial reason (his need for brevity) instead of the fundamental, dogmatic reason (the primacy).

3. Difficulties of the traditional views. Among many two are especially relevant:

(a) If "*in qua . . .*" qualifies *hanc ecclesiam*, how has the tradition of the Apostles been preserved in Rome "by people from all quarters"? W. L. Knox's suggestion (J.T.S. 1946) that this is an allusion to the cosmopolitan character of the Roman church will not do because (i) Irenaeus always uses this phrase to describe the faithfully actually scattered throughout the world; (ii) it must surely refer to the same people as *eos qui sunt undique fideles*; (iii) it does not suit the underlying thought of the context nor Irenaeus' ecclesiology.

(b) *Omnem ecclesiam* cannot be the antecedent of *in qua* because (i) the stylistic structure of the sentence forbids it; (ii) the repetition of *qui sunt undique* would be very clumsy; (iii) it is not true that *hi qui sunt undique* are in each church.

This attractive and convincing interpretation is confirmed by a remarkable parallel in the 4th Book, although M. Nautin does not base any of his arguments on it.

Quapropter eis qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab Apostolis . . . reliquos vero qui absistunt a principali successione, et quocumque loco colliguntur, suspectos habere, vel quasi haereticos et malae sententiae, vel quasi scindentes et elatos et sibi placentes, aut rursus ut hypocritas, quaestus gratia et vanae gloriae hoc operantes (IV, 40, 2).

In this passage *principalis successio* is equivalent to *successio ab Apostolis*. Therefore in our sentence of Book III it is reasonable to translate *principalitatem* by "Apostolic character". The point of *potentior* is to show that, even allowing for the sake of argument an Apostolic origin to these illegitimate assemblies, there is a far more authentic Apostolic character in the universal Church. Since it is inconceivable that a genuinely Apostolic church should disagree in doctrine with the universal Church (all the Apostles taught the same doctrine), then a "church" which plainly teaches a different doctrine from that of the universal Church is not a true church.

The chief difficulty likely to be felt against M. Nautin's interpretation will be a reluctance to take *hanc* in a purely prospective sense. The previous and the subsequent sentences are all about the Roman Church. The long line of commentators who have understood *hanc (ecclesiam)* to refer to Rome seems to indicate that neither the run of the sentence nor the context makes it plain that *hanc* does not refer to Rome. M. Nautin anticipates this objection by pointing out that the commentators have jumped to a conclusion on account of the strong apologetic interest of the passage.

Even if he does not succeed in persuading all scholars to abandon their prejudices he has at least pointed the way out of the maze of difficulties woven around this text.

Anthony Forrester, S.J.

Reference :

- (1) Irénée, "Adv. Haer." III, 3, 2, *église de Rome ou église universelle?* in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 101(1957)37.

(ii) SACRAMENTS AND LITURGY

Le sacrement de la pénitence by Paul Anciaux, Editions Nauwelaerts, Louvain-Paris, 1957. 165 pp.

THE reader will find within the relatively few pages of this book a very useful and accurate summary of the history and theology of the sacrament of Penance. The author does not pretend to give a scholarly treatise; only occasionally does he offer quotations from tradition and the councils. There is no doubt, however, from the author's other writings on the subject, that this book rests on solid learning. While his historical treatment is based on the work of the late Dr Bernhard Poschmann, his doctrine is Thomistic throughout.

The first chapter summarises the history of penitential rites. During the first six centuries, the Church offered an official, public and severe penance called "canonical": with variations between churches, it was generally accorded only once; it involved separation from communion, an *ordo poenitentium* and a more or less public and official reconciliation; it was often put off till death, was not permitted to the clergy from the 4th century, and not generally permitted to married people without consent of the other party. A non-canonical penance developed whereby fallen members of the clergy retired to monasteries to expiate their sins; in monasteries also a form of private, non-sacramental penance was practised as an exercise of humility and an aid to spiritual direction. The Fathers stress submission to the penance of the Church as essential to reconciliation with God: reconciliation with the Church is the efficacious sign of divine reconciliation.

From the 7th century, the Irish and later, Anglo-Saxon, monks preaching on the continent introduced a private penance gradually accepted along with, and finally almost entirely supplanting, the canonical penance. This new form of penance could be received an indefinite number of times. Confession was made to the priest who imposed a penance; this penance accomplished, pardon or reconciliation was then given. Later reconciliation was permitted at confession for the sick and dying, a fuller rite being required if they got better. In the 10th century pardon was given at confession with a rite of reconciliation at the completion of the penance. By the end of the 12th century there is mention of three forms of penance: the solemn canonical penance, rarely administered, for the gravest sins, a public penance for public sins, and the more common private penance. Finally, annual confession with the indicative form of absolution was imposed by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215).

This reviewer dare not venture into an appraisal of the theology contained in the following chapters, nor is it necessary. Suffice it to enumerate aspects stressed by the author which seem of interest. From the historical sketch given above it will be noted that the essential of the sacrament as founded by Christ has never changed: *the penitent confesses his faults and the Church judges and pardons*. Whatever may have been the evolution of the penitential rites, these always involve voluntary submission of the sinner to the Church in its minister.

A necessary prelude to confession is contrition or interior penance; whether the motivation be attrition or perfect contrition, the virtue of penance is founded in repentance and detestation of sin. However, this inner conversion must exteriorise itself; it must be accompanied by the will to confess and expiate. Repentance fulfills itself in exterior penance, that is, submission to the Church mediating union with the Passion of Christ: traditionally, the will to submit to exterior penance indicates the sincerity of the repentance.

Such a submission undoubtedly involves faith and hope. The author puts it well when he calls the sacrament of penance a privileged form of mortification: the shame of revealing one's faults is a strong antidote to pride. The need of continual mortification in a Christian life argues strongly in favour of the frequent reception of the sacrament, as does also the necessity of progressive detachment from sin. In either case, the sacrament of penance becomes a permanent element of spiritual growth.

The other aspects of the sacrament are clearly and briefly developed: the priest as the minister of the Church, his judicial power stemming from orders and jurisdiction, instruction and guidance in confession, the remission of the temporal effects of sin, relations between the sacrament and daily penance, indulgences, the Eucharist, effects of the sacrament on the individual and on the Christian community. An appendix treats of the origin and meaning of indulgences, following Dr Poschmann. While the value of the book as a whole is mainly that of a simple and succinct summary by an acknowledged authority, this appendix is to be peculiarly recommended as an excellent treatment of a question which seems to give constant difficulty to lay people.

Jerome Gagnier, S.J.

Sacramenta non significando operantur?

DR. MASCALL, in his latest book, *The Recovery of Unity*, on page 121 writes: "And, for all the haunting beauty of its stately English prose, the liturgy which Cranmer bequeathed to the Church of England most patently fails to express the nature of the act which, in spite of its defects of structure and wording, it nevertheless validly performs". A critic who takes a single sentence out of its context can hardly escape the charge of unfairness; but it is hoped that the charge is not justly incurred if we examine this sentence with its bold juxtaposition of two very general statements about the Anglican Eucharistic liturgy. Does the sentence not overlook a fundamental principle of sacramental theo-

logy? It is a commonly held doctrine that sacraments belong to the genus of signs, and few would deny the adage "sacramenta significando operantur". Sacraments are self-explanatory gestures, made up of words and actions. Thus they will contain and perform only that which they purport to contain and perform. Sacraments do not perform what they do not signify. If Baptism does not signify spiritual rebirth, then it does not perform or effect this spiritual rebirth. If Matrimony does not signify an inviolable bond between the partners, it will not effect this bond. The *raison d'être* of each sacrament is its very signification, and its effectiveness is bound up with its signification. Even the Book of Common Prayer says this when, in Article XXV, it calls sacraments effectual signs.

The question raised by Dr Mascall may be put in this way. Can a liturgy validly perform that which it fails to express? This might be possible in a sacramental system which conceived the efficacious operation of the sacraments as a force outside of the rite that expressed it. Such a system is not applicable to the sacraments Christ gave to the Church. His sacraments are validly performed only when they express the mind and will of Christ in his Mystical Body. They are not magical formulas which function without relation to the meaning they express. It is true that words and actions have different connotations in different ages, civilisations and liturgical settings. In the Christian sacraments, however, it has always been held that the words and actions of the rite must express the invariable signification that Christ willed each sacrament to have. The liturgical context may affect the real meaning of any particular part of the liturgy; Dr Mascall says that the Anglican liturgy "most patently fails to express the nature of the act", and so implies that no particular formula in that liturgy is sufficient to rectify the defect inherent in the liturgy as a whole. However that may be, the principle remains that the operation of the sacraments is not outside of the rite that expresses it. The power of the sacraments and their signification are so inextricably united that they both demand correct liturgical expression for their valid performance. "Sacramenta significando operantur".

Dr Mascall's assertion, therefore, that the liturgy of Cranmer is so defective that it does not express the Eucharistic act seems to involve the conclusion that it does not validly perform this act.

Martin Campbell, S.J.

Teaching Liturgy in Schools, by Mother Emmanuel, C.S.A. Challoner Publications, 1958. 6s. 6d.

LITURGY, as Christian worship, cannot be a mere side-subject in Catholic education. The true spirit of Liturgy ought to permeate the life of the school and not be confined to certain lessons. This is the thesis of this admirable little book, which tells us exactly how to put over this idea in the classroom, in games and parties at school, and in

the chapel. Mother Emmanuel is obviously a teacher of great experience and a good psychologist. Her book demonstrates how to bring out the supernatural aspect of everyday life at school as well as giving a method of teaching the externals and spirit of Christian worship to children of all age-groups, in the most attractive way.

In her first chapter, "Why teach Liturgy", she points out that Liturgy is not merely one essential feature of Christian worship — Liturgy IS Christian worship. A liturgical training is spread out over the child's whole life in tiny unnoticed fragments that may occur in any context, in any class or conversation. It is the very atmosphere of a child's upbringing. It is not the task of a group of specialists but of every member of the school staff. In the teaching of the Faith, things liturgical and non-liturgical are so closely interwoven that it is impossible to treat the two separately. A clear-cut distinction would be false and undesirable even if it were possible. The teacher is not to be pictured as saying brightly, "Now children, put away your catechisms and we'll have just ten minutes Liturgy before the bell rings".

Mother Emmanuel also indicates the difficulties which arise in liturgical training, especially in girls' schools and day schools. This problem is bound up with the very definition of the Liturgy itself — the official public worship of the Mystical Body, conducted by authorized persons. This the Church performs principally in three ways: — through the Mass, through the Sacraments and through the Divine Office.

In boys' schools more priests are available, and if some of them do parish work it is not difficult to see that the boys assist at the ceremonies of Baptism, Confirmation and even Matrimony, and become familiar with them. Serving on the altar and helping in the sacristy are privileges taken almost in one's stride. From time to time there will be an ordination in the community. These are only some of the factors that make it comparatively easy to maintain a healthy and vigorous liturgical life in a school of this kind. Where the Liturgy proper is not possible, because of a school's circumstances, the answer to the problem of attempting to give a liturgical training lies, Mother Emmanuel says, in the distinction between Liturgy proper and that which is merely liturgical — i.e. related to the Liturgy as closely as possible in its inspiration, texts, music, etc. She suggests, for example, that the doctrine of Purgatory be presented in liturgical form in this way: the doctrine, based on reason as well as on revelation, would be explained in relation to the Sacrament of Penance, the Church's teaching on Indulgences, the Prayers for the Dying and the Mass for the Dead. Purgatory should be treated as near November 2nd as is possible, and the children shown how to gain the Indulgence proper to that day (as often as possible), having made their own private lists of relations and friends of the family who have died. A study of the Mass for the Dead is most revealing especially if the children are asked to find out for themselves how many times the words "life", "light", "rest" and "death" occur. Seniors could learn the *Dies Irae* and younger children could mime it with simple gestures, using trumpet and book, royal judge enthroned, sheep and goats, not

forgetting David and the Sibyl, Mary Magdalen and the Good Thief. (The teacher should also ask whether this sequence *is* about Purgatory or not.)

The chapter on Singing the Liturgy is perhaps a little ambitious but is admirable, especially the ideas about getting the children to recognize what feeling the plainsong is meant to convey, using excerpts from, say, the Gloria of Mass II, *Jesu Redemptor omnium* and one of the lessons of Tenebrae.

The Liturgical Year offers great scope for devoting the various months at school to different themes as their seasons occur. The feasts in the Cycle can be celebrated, for younger children, by games — like having a Hallowe'en party with appropriate games to do with the Saints. Suggestions here include a tray of symbols to be guessed (key = St Peter, bird = St Francis, raven = St Benedict, etc.); "Pit" with families of Saints' names; anagrams from Saints' names to be invented by two teams, each to be worked out by the other team. Children can have cards with Saints' names pinned to their backs and must guess who each is by questioning other member of the party. The "Advent wreath" is another suggestion, and either a Nativity play or carol service will round off this term excellently.

One cannot start too early in the Spring Term preparing the children for Easter and explaining the Holy Week ceremonies. If children can stay at school for these ceremonies (in a Religious house) so much the better. It is an unforgettable experience.

Again and more thoroughly the Mass is examined by the older pupils in the chapter entitled "Towards Maturity". Finally, Mother Emmanuel advocates a good spiritual library to inculcate a taste for good reading.

Anyone who has to teach or deal with children will find this book a great help.

John Shearburn, S.J.

(iii) ECUMENICAL COMMENT

At-One-Ment: Studies in Christian Unity, Vol. 1, 1959.

The Ecumenical Movement: A Catholic Approach, by Gustave Weigel, S.J. Geoffrey Chapman, 1958. 6s.

THERE have recently appeared two slender but solid publications in the field of ecumenism.

The first is the magazine *At-One-Ment* published by the Atonement Seminary in Washington, D.C. Its express aim is to interest the future priests of the Church specifically in the field of Christian unity. This maiden issue, written by members of the Society of the Atonement, covers the significant phases of the ecumenical movement. The opening article by Fr. Hanahoe is a survey of historical and doctrinal positions on ecumenism from the Catholic and non-Catholic standpoints. The remaining articles, dealing with the Oxford Movement, the A.P.C.U.,

Faith and Order, Life and Work movements, the Church of South India, and the Society of the Atonement, round out a view of a momentous and consequential development in modern religious history. Of special value for research is the selected chronological bibliography of Holy See documents on unity work as well as the list of other writings on the same.

The second work is a monograph in the Woodstock Papers Series, *The Ecumenical Movement: A Catholic Approach* by Gustave Weigel, S.J. His purpose is to present simply a primer, an "unpretentious study" of the principles involved in the issue. The analysis in the first section of non-Catholic Ecumenism (i.e. of the essence, structure, membership and activities of the central body, the World Council of Churches) is penetrating enough to warrant the forecast he follows it up with.

The World Council is a coalition of churches organized and inspired by the dynamics of Hope. It is professedly striving for an eventual union in the "una sancta". But Fr. Weigel discerns two opposing tendencies in the Council that are likely to keep the goal of corporate unity for the Christian churches on a visionary plane indefinitely. One wing, which roughly corresponds to the Faith and Order movement, stands out for the postulate of a normative theology and creed as a requirement of unity. The other wing, representing the Life and Work movement, opts for the more conciliatory way of "open communion". The latter group are the forceful majority pressing for union now and seem firmly convinced this is the only feasible solution to ensure the present progress in fellowship among the churches. At the cost of credal integrity it would settle for a least common denominator of Christian belief in order to facilitate the coaptation of Christendom. If this is the real situation within the World Council, then Fr. Weigel sees the future mood and policy of the organization tending more and more to mere co-existence and compromise. The powerful non-dogmatic wing espouse in effect a theological indifferentism and disavow an ecclesiology that would only confirm the sectarian character of the present membership. This group, he fears, are most likely to dominate the movement and impose its spirit of "Anglo-Saxon pragmatism".

To depict the movement in this light is to run the risk of putting up the backs of non-Catholic ecumenists. Fr. Weigel is well aware that the Catholic Church *vis-à-vis* the World Council gives every appearance of intransigence. It is however a posture of conviction, not of indifference. The Catholic Church is intensely interested in the progress toward unity. But the norms and conditions of its interest as well as the activities and efforts of Catholic ecumenists are circumscribed by the Holy Office. The second section of the monograph gives a reliable and straightforward interpretation of the Office's pronouncements for the guidance of Catholics in this venture.

The final section contains some frank and sober "Theological Reflections" on the ecumenism of both sides. Dr. Willem Adolph Visser't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council and authority on ecumenical literature, provides a starting point for Fr. Weigel with his observation on the ambivalence of the Catholic mind on this issue of

unity. By faith and love the Catholic shares with his Christian neighbours the generic aspiration that all may be one in Christ. But unlike the non-Catholic he feels no hesitancy in believing and declaring that the Church towards which all Christians must conspire in unity is the Roman Catholic Church. The Catholic, in Visser't Hooft's opinion, is disappointingly at once an insider and an outsider *vis-à-vis* the aspirations and endeavours of other Christian ecumenists.

This would be quite understandable if the Protestant mind were to recognize once and for all that the Catholic is committed to an unquestionable ecclesiology. And the logical alternative of this for him is not Protestantism but the abjuration of Christianity altogether. Willy-nilly the World Council at present champions an ecclesiology all the more objectionable because it is an implicit and advisedly evasive one. To collaborate or participate formally in the agendas and discussions of the World Council is to concede that all churches have substantially erred, that the true Church of Christ is historically non-existent and unrealizable, that all Christians are nevertheless its members equally, past or future errors notwithstanding. These are the tacit assumptions of the World Council, and until they change there can be no question of a change of official Catholic attitudes.

Yet on the level of informal contacts with Protestants the Catholic must strive to secure and provide better and greater mutual understanding. Not of course at the expense of distorting or compromising Catholic doctrine. The Holy Office is quite explicit in this admonition. To the theologian, however, primarily falls the mission of ecumenist. He has the special charism and presumably the knowledge together with just the right competence and confidence to set forth the Church's doctrine in due perspective and tactful emphasis. But even his efforts must be subject at all times to the episcopal regimen which bears the final responsibility before God of bringing the lost sheep into the one fold under the one true Shepherd.

Joseph Doherty, S.J.

(iv) OTHER QUESTIONS

The World to Come, by R. W. Gleason, S.J. Sheed and Ward, New York, 1958. 172 pp.

A CLIMATE of firm optimism pervades this book on the "Four Last Things", an optimism at once authoritative and infectious. At the same time however, this is a work of considerable scholarship, treating the matter historically and with reference to contemporary philosophical and theological thought.

Man's creation, his present life, and his future, are only purposeful when considered in their relationship to God. This relationship is the first matter discussed. The holy restlessness of the Christian can be calmed only by the life of loving God, which ultimately is the only law for him. Far from being an external imposition, God's will is meant to well up within a man so as to change lonely anguish into loving union.

The love of God is thus the only law proper to man. Yet, with Saint Paul, we all feel that other law within our members, the fundamentally unnatural tyranny which we call sin.

Father Gleason treats sin very fully ; and this is in no way surprising, since without sin there would be only one "last thing" to affect mankind. Sin however, has blurred our prospect of glory in Heaven, and we are shown how the idea of it has changed from one aspect of the Old Testament notion, namely an exterior affront to God on the communal level, to the Christian conception of sin as an individual and interior option for evil in the service of Satan. Sin may thus hurl defiance at the redemptive work of God, but God continues to seek the sinner out. No matter how sin is considered, whether in the setting of history, psychology, or theology, its core is constantly negative and destructive. There is a danger that this negative element may persuade people of the unreality of sin, yet nothing could be more staggeringly true to life than this corruptive force. Only the act of love can engage the knowledge and liberty of the personality to a greater extent.

If the personal nature of sin is comparatively a recent notion, it is quite otherwise with reflection on death. The mystery of death cannot be shared with others ; it is an act before which only the Church can advise us. The Old Testament mentality could view death undismayed because of posterity, the continuation of the race, the carrying on of name and family to countless generations. For the Christian however, death is the portal to true life, not to a mere commemoration in the minds and hearts of others. The Death of Our Lord and the glory of his Resurrection are the everlasting pledge to us of a similar transformation, begun in Baptism, continued by Penance, and constantly strengthened by sacramental graces. Just as Christ chose and accepted his Death, so can the Christian choose the will of God in life and by this choice show his acceptance of the same will in his death. The attitude of the Church to death is one of the profoundest optimism, simply because the Death of Christ can give us grounds for nothing else.

After the particular judgement, the soul will know and understand its eternal sentence ; at the general judgement, all things will be shown as fitting into the triumph of God's love. Here at last all creation will see the identity of law and love.

The second half of the book deals with the states in the future life itself ; Purgatory, Hell, and Heaven being considered in turn. To his chapter on Purgatory Father Gleason has given the title "Redemptive Suffering", and in it he traces the growth of the idea that suffering can be meritorious. The notion is traced through the leading ideas of the Old Testament to the early dogmas of the Infant Church. The comparison of the cleansing of the soul in Purgatory with the painful uprooting of habits often necessary before a sick mind can be restored, is among the most interesting ideas in this illuminating section of the book. By a crisis of growth most keenly felt, the valid self emerges and leaves behind the past so as to be absorbed in a continuing present of love.

For all his insistence on love and on the merciful designs of God,

Father Gleason in no way plays down the fact of Hell. The most terrible words possible to God—"I know you not", describe a dreadful possibility, the fulfilment not of Divine retribution, but of human choosing. The fires of Hell are the sinner's last success, a ghastly twisting of the intended order of things in which God grants the sinner his wish. Here again the comparison between the anguish of a split personality and that of the soul in Hell is suggested with compelling force: "Now the sinner is at last aware of the consequences of his chosen rejections of God. On earth the just man says to God, "Thy will be done". The sinner refuses this reverence to God. Now it is God who, with a kind of tragic rightness, says to him, "Thy will be done". (page 126).

The last chapters concern Resurrection and Heaven. By the resurrection of all the members of the Mystical Body, the triumph of Christ will be completed. This faith in the Resurrection is the foundation-stone of Christianity, but too often a firm belief in the immortality of the soul involves a neglect of the resurrected body. The final resurrection will affect the whole of man, the total composite, gloriously transfigured but still recognisable as the one that others knew and loved on earth. Beings such as this inhabit the beauty of Heaven, where grace is prolonged in glory, nature is fulfilled, and all our capacities are fully extended. Each personality survives radiantly in Heaven, most fully and happily leading the life of love—"vita mutatur, non tollitur"; there is change but no diminishing, a constant blooming with no withering to follow. This is the life for which man is intended, the life that will be made his by charity. Considered in such a light, the four last things can only stimulate our faith and our hope.

Michael O'Halloran, S.J.

Orientaciones bibliográficas sobre San Ignacio de Loyola, by Ignacio Iparraguirre, S.J.

Bibliographia de historia S.J. in regnis olim corona hungarica unitis (1560-1773), by Ladislaus Polgár, S.J. 184 pp. (Subsidia ad Historiam S.J., nos 1 and 2; Rome, Institutum historicum S.J., 1957).

THIS new series of *Subsidia ad historiam S.J.* will be welcomed by those who are already acquainted with the valuable work produced by the Historical Institute of the Society of Jesus in Rome in its *Bibliotheca* series and its periodical *Archivum Historicum S.J.* The aim of the series is to provide practical helps which will facilitate study of the main strands which make up the complex history of the Society. In large part it will consist of specialised bibliographies which will open the way to understanding both of the mainsprings of the development of the Society as a whole and of the particular manifestations of this development in various individuals, regions and fields of activity. Also a number of the works in the series will probably be outline studies of some universal element in the history of the Society, while others will be more topographical in nature.

The worth of the first volume in the series is guaranteed by the name of its author, who is widely known as an expert in the matters it deals with. Few people in recent years can have done as much as Fr Iparraguirre to forward studies connected with St Ignatius and his spirituality and influence. His written works in these fields can be divided roughly into three classes: editing, particularly of source-material; publication of the results of his own historical research; and production of smaller works intended to help those who are new to these studies. Examples of these are his volume on the Directories to the Spiritual Exercises in the Monumenta Historica series, his two volumes on the *Historia de la práctica de los Ejercicios Espirituales de San Ignacio de Loyola*, and the *Dirección de una tanda de Ejercicios*, which is an amplification and practical application of a booklet written for those who are preparing to give retreats.

This present work is the fruit of large experience and is the extension to wider fields of his notes on "historiografía ignaciana" in his one-volume *Obras completas de San Ignacio* (B.A.C.) and, to a lesser extent, of the bibliographies in that volume and those on the Exercises written for the periodical *Manresa* over a number of years. Its value lies particularly in the fact that it provides a judicious selection of works in European languages which best guide further studies on all points connected with St Ignatius, and gives some idea of the content of many of them. The judgements of works mentioned are not all those of Fr Iparraguirre; he has been careful to incorporate those of other experts, so as to avoid too subjective a view. For those who wish to study any one point in greater detail, mention is made of other bibliographies, published as such or contained in other works.

Only one word of warning is needed. The student who wishes to restrict himself to works in English will not find a great deal to help him — but this is no fault of the author's. Also some of the periodicals mentioned will not be readily obtained in this country.

Fr Polgár's book does not disappoint the expectations for the series aroused by the first volume, for it will certainly be of value to all who are interested in the history of the old Society. The "Regna olim corona hungarica unita" of the title are about twice as large as Great Britain and include Hungary, Slovakia, Croatia and Slavonia (now parts of Yugoslavia), Transylvania (now a part of Rumania) and Ruthenia (which after the second world war was absorbed into the Soviet Union). The Jesuits' activity in this area before the suppression was striking: they had 18 colleges, 20 residences and 11 mission-houses, most of which belonged to the old Austrian Province. However, as B. Duhr in his well-known book *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge* does not mention their achievements, Fr Polgár's present collection is all the more valuable. He lists more than 1,600 works — books and articles — with scientific accuracy and great skill and clarity in presentation. The book is divided into four main parts: general history, history of culture, history of houses, history of persons.

In the first part Fr Polgár enumerates 157 sources divided into three periods within which they are arranged in order of importance. In the second part, which contains 175 sources, he arranges the matter under useful and well-selected subdivisions, such as literature, arts, ecclesiastical sciences, profane sciences, etc. The greater, and the more valuable, part of the book is devoted to the history of houses and persons. It deals individually with 51 Jesuit Houses and nearly 100 notable Jesuits of that time, and provides, as far as possible, a complete list of sources.

On the score of completeness, which is so important in such collections, there can be no criticism; on the contrary it might be objected that several of his citations border on the insignificant. This is, however, by no means due to any lack of prudent judgement, but to the fact that the author, whose age is 39, left the country more than 10 years ago and hence was obliged to do his work outside a territory which was, and is now, behind the Iron Curtain. The author himself explains his difficulty in the preface of his book, mentioning that he was unable to check personally a third part of the bibliography, i.e. 524 items of a total 1,611. But in spite of that difficulty he has achieved his aim and has produced a very useful book, one which will be a great help to all who wish to work on the early history of the Society in this part of Europe.

Michael Kyne, S.J.

Erwin Nemesszeghy, S.J.